

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were examined. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 3, 11, 12 and 20 are amended; claims 4 and 5 are canceled; and claims 26-34 are hereby added to more particularly claim Applicants' invention. Claims 1-3 and 5-34 are now pending. Applicants hereby request further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyake et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,903,618 (Miyake). Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 11, 13, 15 and 20 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gary Aitkenhead, Great Britain Patent No. GB2336070 (Gary), while claims 3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 16-19 and 21-25 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Gary in view of Miyake. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11 and 20 to more particularly claim the invention. Accordingly, all rejections are believed to be rendered moot.

As amended, independent claim 1 and 32 more particularly recite that the second remote unit synchronizes to the first remote unit during direct communication with the first remote unit via the dedicated radio frequency connection. Similarly, independent method claim 20 more particularly recites the step of synchronizing the second remote unit to the first remote unit during direct communication between the first remote unit and the second remote unit via the dedicated communication channel.

Miyake and Gary both fail to disclose, teach or suggest a cordless communication system or method for providing direct radio frequency communication between remote unites in a cordless communication system, as recited in independent claims 1, 11 and 20, respectively. Specifically, Miyake fails to disclose, teach or suggest a second remote unit that synchronizes to the first remote unit during direct communication with the first remote unit via the dedicated radio frequency connection. Instead, Miyake specifically discloses that

All the terminals included in the service area of the base station are *always* synchronized with sync signals paged from the base station.

Miyake, Abstract (emphasis added). Thus, *all* terminals of the Miyake system *always* synchronize to the base station. Nowhere does Miyake disclose that one of the terminals of his system may temporarily generate a second sync signal so that other terminals may synchronize with that terminal.

Gary fails to make up for this defect in the Miyake reference. As noted by the Patent Office in making the rejection of claims 5 and 14, Gary fails to disclose, teach or suggest synchronizing the second remote unit to the first remote unit during direct communication between the first remote unit and the second remote unit via a dedicated radio frequency connection. Consequently, neither Miyake nor Gary, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the cordless communication systems or the method for providing direct radio frequency communication between remote units in a cordless communication system, as presently recited in independent claims 1, 11 and 20. Independent claims 1, 11 and 20, along with their respective dependent claims, are therefore believed to be patentable over the cited references for at least the above reasons.

Support for new claims 26-34 is found in the specification at page 6, lines 11-30. No new matter is entered. Applicant respectfully submits that the art of record fails to disclose, teach or suggest a cordless communication system comprising a central unit; a first remote unit for radio frequency communication with the central unit, the first unit synchronizing to the central unit during communication with the central unit; and a second remote unit for radio frequency communication with the central unit and the first unit, the second remote unit synchronizing to the central unit during communication with the central unit, wherein upon receiving a request from the first remote unit, the central unit assigns a dedicated radio frequency connection for enabling direct communication between said first remote unit and said second remote unit, the first remote unit functioning as a temporary central unit for the second remote unit during direct communication between the first remote unit and the second remote unit so that the second remote unit synchronizes to the first remote, as claimed in claims 32-34. Applicant further respectfully submits that the prior art of record fails to disclose, teach or suggest assigning an orthogonal spreading code or hop-frequency to the remote units as claimed in dependent claims 26-31 and 33-

34. Accordingly, claims 26-34 are believed to be patentable over the art of record and the prior art in general.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Date: Sept. 10, 2004

Respectfully requested,

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

By: Thomas George
Thomas George
Registration No. 45,740
Attorney for Applicants
Tel: 650-694-5191
Fax: 650-968-4517